A U M

New worlds are never discovered all at once. A new hemisphere may be glimpsed first only as a few small islands, or an electrical universe as a few tiny sparks.
—J. B. RHINE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIII June, 1955 No. 8

FOR ALL MANKIND

PERIODICALLY, the question of how best to promulgate Theosophy is raised, and what, in the way of literature and language offers the most rewarding means of effecting a permeation of "the race mind." And, it is always realized, Theosophy is not the exclusive property of a select few, but needed by and also intended for "the masses."

Theosophy *is* "for" the masses. Yet the best means to reach the masses are by no means clear. In *The Key to Theosophy,* for example, H. P. Blavatsky replies to the inquirer concerning the importance of "all this metaphysics and mysticism" (p. 247):

> To the masses, who need only practical guidance and support, they are not of much consequence; but for the educated, the natural leaders of the masses, those whose modes of thought and action will sooner or later be adopted by those masses, they are of the greatest importance. It is only by means of the philosophy that an intelligent and educated man can avoid the intellectual suicide of believing on blind faith; and it is only by assimilating the strict continuity and logical coherence of the Eastern, if not esoteric, doctrines, that he can realize their truth.

H.P.B. explores this sequence of influence more thoroughly in her article, "The Tidal Wave":

> A new era has begun in literature, this is certain. New thoughts and new interest have created new intellectual needs; hence a new race of authors is springing up. . . . It is finally those who, amidst the present wholesale dominion of the worship of matter, material interests and

SELFISHNESS, will have bravely fought for human rights and *man's divine nature,* who will become, if they only win, the teachers of the masses in the coming century, and so their benefactors.

In order that one should fully comprehend *individual* life with its physiological, psychic and spiritual mysteries, he has to devote himself with all the fervor of unselfish philanthropy and love for his brother men, to studying and knowing *collective* life, or Mankind. . . . How many of such profound readers of life may be found in our boasted age of sciences and culture? . . . Yet, it is only they who can carry out the task of perseverance. To them alone is given the mission of turning the "Upper Ten" of social circles from the broad and easy highway of wealth, vanity and empty pleasures into the arduous and thorny path of higher moral problems, and the perception of loftier moral duties than they are now pursuing. . . .

In the face of the present degradation of every ideal, as also of the noblest aspirations of the human heart, becoming each day more prominent in the higher classes, what can be expected from the "great unwashed"? It is the head that has to guide the feet, and the latter are to be hardly held responsible for their actions. Work, therefore, to bring about the moral regeneration of the cultured but far more immoral classes before you attempt to do the same for our ignorant younger Brethren. . . .

If asked, what is it then that will help, we answer boldly:—Theosophical literature; hastening to add that under this term, neither books concerning adepts and phenomena, nor the Theosophical Society publications are meant. Speak to the awakening Spirit of Humanity, to the human Spirit and the Spirit in man, . . .

Over against this passage, or at least beside it, should be set the following by William Q. Judge, taken from his article, "The Closing Cycle," in which he gives some attention to an article by A. P. Sinnett:

What seems to me either a printer's error or a genuine mistake in Mr. Sinnett's article is on page 26, where he says: "will be knowledge generally diffused throughout the *cultured classes.*" The italics are mine. No greater error could seem possible. The cultured classes are perfectly worthless, as a whole, to the Master-builders of the Lodge. They are good in the place they have, but they represent the "established order" and the acme of selfishness. Substitute *masses* for *cultured classes,* and you will come nearer the truth. Not the cultured but the ignorant masses have kept alive the belief in the occult and the psychic now fanned into flame once more. Had we trusted to the cultured the small ember would long ago have been extinguished. We may drag in the cultured, but it will be but to have a languid and unenthusiastic interest.

A few months later, a questioner in the *Theosophical Forum* (July, 1895) asked if "theosophical doctrines are for the cultured classes?" Mr. Judge made this reply:

> If theosophical doctrines are to be of any benefit to the race, then they must be for all classes, poor and rich, cultured and uncultured, young and old. Some people think that these doctrines are really only comprehensible by the educated and cultured; that most attention should be paid to these classes, to learned scientists, and to those who possess a worldly and powerful reputation. For, they argue, if we can get hold of such, then we may more quickly affect the others.
>
> But what has experience shown? . . . The theosophical propaganda has gone forward in the face of considerable opposition and coldness from the so-called better classes. Very true it is that the working, laboring classes have not pushed it, nor do they, as a whole, know a very great deal about it; yet that indefinite section of the working classes sometimes called the "middle class" has been its great propagator and supporter.
>
> As to understanding the doctrines, it is my opinion that this is as easy for the uneducated as for the educated.

Before passing to general considerations, it should be useful to quote another passage from the *Key,* directly related to this last point: "You forget one thing"—H.P.B. says to the inquirer, who claims that even the educated find Theosophy difficult—"which is that your much-boasted modern education is precisely that which makes it difficult for you to understand Theosophy. Your mind is so full of intellectual subtleties and preconceptions that your natural intuition and perception of the truth cannot act. It does not require metaphysics or education to make a man understand the broad truths of Karma and Reincarnation. Look at the millions of poor and uneducated Buddhists and Hindoos, to whom Karma and Reincarnation are solid realities, simply because their minds have never been cramped and distorted by being forced into an unnatural groove. They have never had the innate human sense of justice perverted in them by being told to believe that their sins would be forgiven because another man had been put to death for their sakes."

Some may suppose, taking all these quotations together, that there is a radical difference between the views of H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge on the propagation of Theosophy. Yet is this really the case? H.P.B., we may note, wrote in England, where class lines

were stronger than in nineteenth-century America, and she was also calling attention to the constant historical pattern in every great movement that has had an *educational* influence upon mankind: the gradual filtering down to every stratum of society of the beneficent ideas set afloat by leading minds. Judge, on the other hand, seems to have been writing about the "cultured classes" in a somewhat different context, the term apparently indicating the parlors of the trivially occupied rich. He was opposing an effort to *cater* to a special class, whereas H.P.B. was suggesting that "natural leaders" whatever their class, must work to transform thought at the higher social levels.

Since H.P.B. and Judge wrote on this subject, extensive changes have come about in the constitution of the population. The so-called "working classes" referred to by Mr. Judge have practically merged entirely into the Middle Class, which now includes almost everyone. The United States has the distinction of having achieved what may be termed a "classless" society, despite the fact that there are a few very rich people in America. Money has become less and less of a distinction, and while the rush after the dollar is as intense as it ever was, the difference between the rich and the "comfortably fixed" is, socially speaking, of far less importance than in the last century.

Now, as then, there is no easy way of determining where the prospects for Theosophical appeal may lie. They are found in all classes or callings. There seems to be no particular set of environmental conditions which predispose a person to an interest in Theosophy. Meanwhile, the level of education in the United States has been considerably higher in the years since the Theosophical Society was founded. For example, in the period from 1870 to 1945, the general population of America tripled, but the enrollment in high schools was multiplied by ninety, and that of colleges by thirty. Here is ample justification for regarding the United States as populated by a single "middle class."

The potential Theosophists are characterized, therefore, not by any particular class alignment, but may turn up anywhere. The sole requirement is to qualify in some measure as having the interests described by H.P.B. in "The Tidal Wave": "Without preconceptions or prejudice, as also without the least fear of possible results in one or another direction, he has to decipher, understand and *remember* the deep and innermost feelings and the aspirations of the poor people's great and suffering heart." These, she intimates in the *Key,* are not likely to be found among the orthodox in religion:

> We prefer immeasurably more in our society Agnostics, and even rank Atheists, to bigots of whatever religion. An Agnostic's mind is ever opened to the truth; whereas the latter blinds the bigot like the sun does an owl. The best—*i.e.,* the most truth-loving, philanthropic, and honest—of our Fellows were, and are, Agnostics and Atheists (disbelievers in a *personal* God.)

Here, then, is the judgment and the experience of the two principal Founders of the Theosophical Movement. The need is obviously for literate and ardent *workers* for the Theosophic cause, yet such workers are not to be found in any particular segment of society, nor can they be sought out in any particular way. "Specialists," for example, those who are intensely concerned with a particular approach to human problems, may be largely humanitarian, yet their karmic involvements be such as to keep them from dividing their energies in this incarnation. If Theosophy comes to their notice by natural means, they will have opportunity to choose for themselves. Meanwhile, if students were to spend their energies pursuing individuals whom they believe to be "promising," they may neglect others who are in fact "ready" to ally themselves directly with the Movement.

The best counsel, perhaps, to students in their work of promulgation is to attempt to be in all things *natural,* and to trust in the fact that their own interest and devotion, if deep and sincere, will establish exactly the attractive power that is needed for this time and cycle. The student who finds himself comprehending more and more of the teaching himself will develop a natural enthusiasm and desire to communicate that will have far more influence than any sort of "planned" propaganda. "Simplicity," for example, is not something that can be put on like a change of clothing. The best simplicity comes from a feeling of sympathy for others, for then what is said arises in response to the *needs* of others. This is the sort of simplicity which Mr. Judge possessed, and Mr. Crosbie also.

So, from generation to generation, the temper of the times will change and the constitution of society will alter, now affording wider or narrower access to the minds of men, as the case may be. We cannot control these changes. What we can control and direct is our own sense of wanting to be clear, and we can support our efforts with the conviction that grows from careful study and long reflection. If we do this, those who are ready will hear, and this is all that we can hope for or expect.

ANTIQUITY OF THE VEDAS

A JOURNAL interested like the THEOSOPHIST in the explorations of archæology and archaic religions, as well as the study of the occult in nature, has to be doubly prudent and discreet. To bring the two conflicting elements—exact science and metaphysics—into direct contact, might create as great a disturbance as to throw a piece of potassium into a basin of water. The very fact that we are predestined and pledged to prove that some of the wisest of Western scholars have been misled by the dead letter of appearances and that they are unable to discover the hidden spirit in the relics of old, places us under the ban from the start. With those sciolists who are neither broad enough, nor sufficiently modest to allow their decisions to be reviewed, we are necessarily in antagonism. Therefore, it is essential that our position in relation to certain scientific hypotheses, perhaps tentative and only sanctioned for want of better ones—should be clearly defined at the outset.

An infinitude of study has been bestowed by the archæologists and the orientalists upon the question of chronology—especially in regard to Comparative Theology. So far, their affirmations as to the relative antiquity of the great religions of the pre-Christian era are little more than plausible hypotheses. How far back the national and religious Vedic period, so called, extends—"it is impossible to tell," confesses Prof. Max Müller; nevertheless, he traces it "to a period anterior to 1000 B.C., and brings us "to 1100 or 1200 B.C., as the earliest time when we may suppose the collection of the Vedic hymns to have been finished." Nor do any other of our leading scholars claim to have finally settled the vexed question, especially delicate as it is in its bearing upon the chronology of the book of Genesis. Christianity, the direct outflow of Judaism and in most cases the State religion of their respective countries, has unfortunately stood in their way. Hence, scarcely two scholars agree; and each assigns a different date to the Vedas and the Mosaic books, taking care in every case to give the latter the benefit of the doubt. Even that leader of the leaders in philological and chronological questions,—Professor Müller, hardly twenty

---

NOTE.—This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for October 1879, and was reprinted in THEOSOPHY 2: 468.

years ago allowed himself a prudent margin by stating that it will be difficult to settle "whether the Veda is 'the oldest of books,' and whether some of the portions of the old Testament may not be traced back to the same or even an earlier date than the oldest hymns of the Veda." The THEOSOPHIST is, therefore, quite warranted in either adopting or rejecting as it pleases the so-called authoritative chronology of science. Do we err then, in confessing that we rather incline to accept the chronology of that renowned Vedic scholar, Swami Dayanund Saraswati, who unquestionably knows what he is talking about, has the four Vedas by heart, is perfectly familiar with all Sanskrit literature, has no such scruples as the Western Orientalists in regard to public feelings, nor desire to humour the superstitious notions of the majority, nor has any object to gain in suppressing facts? We are only too conscious of the risk in withholding our adulation from scientific authorities. Yet, with the common temerity of the heterodox we must take our course, even though, like the Tarpeia of old, we be smothered under a heap of shields—a shower of learned quotations from these "authorities."

We are far from feeling ready to adopt the absurd chronology of a Berosus or even Syncellus—though in truth they appear "absurd" only in the light of our preconceptions. But, between the extreme claims of the Brahmins and the ridiculously short periods conceded by our Orientalists for the development and full growth of that gigantic literature of the ante-Mahabharatan period, there ought to be a just mean. While Swami Dayanund Saraswati asserts that "The Vedas have now ceased to be objects of study for nearly 5,000 years," and places the first appearance of the four Vedas at an immense antiquity; Professor Müller, assigning for the composition of even the earliest among the Brahmanas, the years from about 1,000 to 800 B.C., hardly dares, as we have seen, to place the collection and the original composition of the Sanhitâ, of Rig-Vedic hymns earlier than 1200 to 1500 before our era!* Whom ought we to believe; and which of the two is the better informed? Cannot this gap of several thousand years be closed, or would it be equally difficult for either of the two cited authorities to give data which would be regarded by science as thoroughly convincing? It is as easy to reach a false conclusion by the modern inductive method as to assume false premises from which to make deductions. Doubtless Professor Max Müller has good reasons for arriving at his

* Lecture on the Vedas.

chronological conclusions. But so has Dayanund Saraswati, Pandit. The gradual modifications, development and growth of the Sanskrit language are sure enough for an expert philologist. But, that there is a possibility of his having been led into error would seem to suggest itself upon considering a certain argument brought forward by Swami Dayanund. Our respected friend and teacher maintains that both Professor Müller and Dr. Wilson have been solely guided in their researches and conclusion by the inaccurate and untrustworthy commentaries of Sayana, Mahidar, and Uvata, commentaries which differ diametrically from those of a far earlier period as used by himself in connection with his great work the Veda Bhashya. A cry was raised at the outset of this publication that Swami's commentary is calculated to refute Sayana and the English interpreters. "For this," very justly remarks Pandit Dayanund, "I cannot be blamed; if Sayana has erred, and English interpreters have chosen to take him for their guide, the delusion cannot be long maintained. Truth alone can stand, and Falsehood before growing civilization must fall."† And if, as he claims, his Veda Bhashya is entirely founded on the old commentaries of the ante-Mahabharatan period to which the Western scholars have had no access, then, since his were the surest guides of the two classes, we cannot hesitate to follow him, rather than the best of our European Orientalists.

But, apart from such *primâ facie* evidence, we would respectfully request Professor Max Müller to solve us a riddle. Propounded by himself, it has puzzled us for over twenty years, and pertains as much to simple logic as to the chronology in question. Clear and undeviating, like the Rhône through the Geneva lake, the idea runs through the course of his lectures, from the first volume of "Chips" down to his last discourse. We will try to explain.

All who have followed his lectures as attentively as ourselves will remember that Professor Max Müller attributes the wealth of myths, symbols, and religious allegories in the Vedic hymns, as in Grecian mythology, to the early worship of nature by man. "In the hymns of the Vedas," to quote his words, "we see man left to himself to solve the riddle of this world. He is awakened from darkness and slumber by the light of the sun" . . . and he calls it—"his life, his truth, his brilliant Lord and Protector." He gives names to all the powers of

† Answer to the Objections to the Veda-Bhashya.

nature, and after he has called the fire "Agni," the sun-light "Indra," the storms "Maruts," and the dawn "Usha," they all seem to grow naturally into beings like himself, nay greater than himself.* This definition of the mental state of *primitive* man, in the days of the very infancy of humanity, and when hardly out of its cradle—is perfect. The period to which he attributes these effusions of an infantile mind, is the Vedic period, and the time which separates us from it is, as claimed above, 3,000 years. So much impressed seems the great philologist with this idea of the mental feebleness of mankind at the time when these hymns were composed by the four venerable Rishis, that in his introduction to the Science of Religion (p. 278) we find the Professor saying: "Do you still wonder at polytheism or at mythology? Why, they are inevitable. They are, if you like, a *parler enfantin* of religion. But the world has its childhood, and when it was a child it spake as a child, (*nota bene,* 3,000 years ago), it understood as a child, it thought as a child. . . . The fault rests with us if we insist on *taking the language of children for the language of men*. . . . The language of antiquity is the language of childhood . . . the *parler enfantin* in religion is not extinct . . . as, for instance, the religion of India."

Having read thus far, we pause and think. At the very close of this able explanation, we meet with a tremendous difficulty, the idea of which must have never occurred to the able advocate of the ancient faiths. To one familiar with the writings and ideas of this Oriental scholar, it would seem the height of absurdity to suspect him of accepting the Biblical chronology of 6,000 years since the appearance of the first man upon earth as the basis of his calculations. And yet the recognition of such chronology is inevitable if we have to accept Professor Müller's reasons at all; for here we run against a purely arithmetical and mathematical obstacle, a gigantic miscalculation of proportion . . .

No one can deny that the growth and development of mankind—mental as well as physical—must be analogically measured by the growth and development of man. An anthropologist, if he cares to go beyond the simple consideration of the relations of man to other members of the animal kingdom, has to be in a certain way a physiologist as well as an anatomist; for, as much as ethnology it is a progressive science which can be well treated but by those who are able

* *Chips from a German Workshop,* Vol. 1, p. 68.

to follow up retrospectively the regular unfolding of human faculties and powers, assigning to each a certain period of life. Thus, no one would regard a skull in which the wisdom-tooth, so called, would be apparent, the skull of an infant. Now, according to geology, recent researches "give good reasons to believe that under low and base grades the existence of man can be traced back into the tertiary times." In the old glacial drift of Scotland—says Professor W. Draper "the relics of man are found along with those of the fossil elephant;" and the best calculations so far assign a period of two-hundred-and-forty thousand years since the beginning of the last glacial period. Making a proportion between 240,000 years—the least age we can accord to the human race,—and 24 years of a man's life, we find that three thousand years ago, or the period of the composition of Vedic hymns, mankind would be just twenty-one—the legal age of maturity, and certainly a period at which man ceases using, if he ever will, the *parler enfantin* or childish lisping. But, according to the views of the Lecturer, it follows that man was, three thousand years ago, at twenty-one, a foolish and undeveloped—though a very promising—infant, and at twenty-four, has become the brilliant, acute, learned, highly analytical and philosophical man of the nineteenth century. Or, still keeping our equation in view, in other words, the Professor might as well say, that an individual who was a nursing baby at 12 M. on a certain day, would at 12:20 P.M., on the same day, have become an adult speaking high wisdom instead of his *parler enfantin!*

It really seems the duty of the eminent Sanskritist and Lecturer on Comparative Theology to get out of this dilemma. Either the Rig-Veda hymns were composed but 3,000 years ago, and therefore, cannot be expressed in the "language of childhood"—man having lived in the glacial period—but the generation which composed them must have been composed of adults, presumably as philosophical and scientific in the knowledge of their day, as we are in our own; or, we have to ascribe to them an immense antiquity in order to carry them back to the days of human mental infancy. And, in this latter case, Professor Max Müller will have to withdraw a previous remark, expressing the doubt "whether some of the portions of the Old Testament may not be traced back to the same or even an earlier date than the oldest hymns of the Vedas."

WORD PUZZLES

THE word *objective,* especially in its psychological and philosophical connotations, very much resembles a nest of Chinese boxes. For instance, one might think that to be *objective* means to limit one's concern to sense data; *Webster* takes this meaning into account, remarking that one correct definition of *objective* is "perceptible to the senses or derived from sense perception; as *objective* data." However, this is not a preferred use of the term, even in *Webster,* and it is difficult not to be aware of the fact that "objectivity" has represented, for many devoted to the spirit of scientific method, the attempt to discipline one's own emotions in order to see facts clearly. As Arthur Morgan has recently written, in explanation of the scientific ideal: "Few factors tend more to cloud judgment than habits of living that are inconsistent with the conclusions of critical, objective inquiry."

But it might easily seem that the *objective* person restricts his concerns to the material plane, and hence to matters pertaining to his own "lower nature," for to devotees of science, to be *objective* signifies *sacrificing* one's own biases in the impersonal quest for truth. In other words, one tries to *abstract* his "lower nature" from a situation in order to make fair appraisal, and allows the higher self to enter into the deliberations, and regards himself *as if* he were but an impersonal "object."

Impersonality paradoxically requires a focusing of the higher *Buddhi-manasic* faculties, to use the Sanscrit terminology. Impartial reason and the voice of intuition must be activated in order to enable man to view himself dispassionately.

Webster takes account of these considerations in the following definition:

> *Objective.* Emphasizing or expressing the nature of reality as it is apart from self-consciousness; treating events or phenomena as external rather than as affected by one's reflections or feelings; expressing facts without distortion from one's personal feelings or prejudice.

We thus discover that respect for objectivity is characteristic—and characteristically good—in our present culture. A popular novel of the moment, for instance, contains this sentence, representing the

ethical transformation of one of the leading characters who finally develops a genuine concern for other human beings with whom he is not immediately and personally allied:

> Something was happening to him now. He liked the feeling. He was beginning to care what happened to others with an objectivity that allowed him to escape from himself. He couldn't say what had started it. He only knew that he had felt its first sharp impact last night.

Clearly, in Theosophical terms, it is this capacity to stand apart from oneself that is the beginning of true spiritual awareness. Buddha's vision in the forest during his night of torment was a vision compounded of innumerable desires and forces bound hitherto to his own personal nature, but now focused impersonally before the screen of an arhat's vision. Buddha saw desires and attitudes of his own *as if* they were another's, and thus was able to be completely detached from them. Similarly, the basic intent in psychotherapy is to encourage the patient to bring into "objective" relief various feelings and impressions which have been exerting a detrimental influence on the subconscious mind. Like Buddha's demons, these inhibiting forces are carried upward into the light of reason, where they then assume their correct shapes and colorations.

Since we have already devoted some space in this series to what is now called "the science of semantics," it is interesting to note that, in portions of semantic literature, an additional reverse twist is given to the meaning of objectivity. Korzybski, in *Science and Sanity,* indicates that the tendency to regard something as being objective or factual, when it is simply the result of one of our personal "high order abstractions," leads to vast confusion:

> If, through lack of consciousness of abstracting, we identify or confuse words with objects and feelings, or memories and "ideas" with experiences which belong to the un-speakable objective level, we identify higher order abstractions with lower. Since this special type of semantic identification or confusion is extremely general, it deserves a special name. I call it *objectification,* because it is generally the confusion of words or verbal issues (memories, "ideas") with objective, un-speakable levels, such as objects, or experiences, or feelings. If we objectify, we *forget,* or we *do not remember* that words *are not* the objects or feelings themselves, that the verbal levels are always different from the objective levels. When we identify them, we disregard the inherent differences, and so proper evaluation and full adjustment become impossible.

However, this is special usage for *objective,* and we find elsewhere in the writings of semanticists an expected concern with *developing* objectivity. From a semantic point of view, the first and most important step in viewing a thing objectively is realizing and remembering that no matter how fully we describe an object, person, situation, etc., no matter how many characteristics we are able to "abstract," we can never abstract *all,* can never completely describe. Then we collect all the "facts" we possibly can; from those facts, we draw inferences; we consider the inferences, and then evaluate or make judgments. If we confuse this *order* (as, for example, basing judgments on description), we have ceased to think objectively.

The following tabulation, from Kenneth S. Keyes' *How to Develop Your Thinking Ability,* gives a useful break-down of "the tools" of *objective* thinking:

1. "So far as I know" —recognizes the non-allness of our description.
2. "Up to a point" —that most things are not black *or* white, good *or* bad, but a mixture.
3. "To me" —that we are seeing from our own point of view, on the basis of our past experience, and with our particular prejudices and preconceptions.
4. "The WHAT Index" —that no two things in this world are identical; thing $_1$ is not thing $_2$; man $_1$ is not man $_2$.
5. "The WHEN Index" —that everything is constantly changing; Jones (1940) is not necessarily Jones (1950).
6. "The WHERE Index" —that circumstances alter cases; situations alter reactions, etc.

The student of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine* may recall that she there defines Theosophy itself as "a system of *objective* idealism," while discussing the philosophy of Leibniz in comparison to that of Spinoza. "Esoteric philosophy," she writes, "teaching an *objective* Idealism—though it regards the *objective* Universe and all in it as *Maya,* temporary illusion—draws a practical distinction between collective illusion, *Mahamaya,* from the purely metaphysical stand-point, and the *objective* relations in it between various conscious *Egos* so long as this illusion lasts."

In *Isis Unveiled* we find a similar point made in another connection:

> Esoteric philosophers held that everything in nature is but a materialization of spirit. The Eternal First Cause is latent spirit, they

said, and matter from the beginning. "In the beginning was the word . . . and the word was God." While conceding the idea of such a God to be an unthinkable abstraction to human reason, they claimed that the unerring human instinct grasped it as a deeper reminiscence of something concrete to it though intangible to our physical senses. With the first idea, which emanated from the double-sexed and hitherto-inactive Deity, the first motion was communicated to the whole universe, and the electric thrill was instantaneously felt throughout the boundless space. Spirit begat force, and force matter; and thus the latent deity manifested itself as a creative energy.

Now if it is possible for there to be "something concrete" to the higher perceptive faculties, we can easily see a relationship between esoteric doctrine and the concern of the scientist who fears that it takes a man of considerable stature to *be* "objective." If *objective* simply meant that which was measurable or physical, the lower orders of mammalian life would be able to be much more *objective* than man. But it is subjective accomplishment which enables one to separate fancy and bias from perception of true relationships. Joseph Shipley, in his always provocative *Dictionary of Word Origins,* summarizes the basic point in the following manner: "*Subjective,*" he writes, "from the grammatical sense, means concerned with the *subject,* hence with the first person, oneself; *objective,* from similar usage, means with personal emotions removed."

The Craving for Synthesis

If you satisfy the heart alone, the understanding stands to its arms, and with justice protests: if the understanding alone, the heart is in revolt, and with equal justice refuses to be satisfied. . . . Yet again, whence and why this determination to discover truth, irrespective of any certainty that it will prove either pleasant or profitable? A strange quest surely, and a strange conviction that the truth will not disappoint or betray us. . . . The miseries of man arose, the story goes, from the eating of the fruit of knowledge. But the peculiar and mysterious fact is that we continue to crave for it, to consume it with eager appetites.

—W. Macneile Dixon

THOUGHTS ON "AFTER-DEATH" DOCTRINES

OF the vast output of occult doctrines by H. P. Blavatsky, none was more eagerly welcomed than those pertaining to man's post-mortem existence. The irrational dogmas of the churches in respect to the hereafter, and the sudden rise and phenomenal growth of Spiritualism, moreover, created an imperative need for the presentation of the immemorial teachings of the Wisdom-Religion on this vital subject. The religious dogmas, travestied copies at best of once well-known truths, were fast losing their hold on an age characterized by an ever more insistent demand for rational explanations.

The appeal of Spiritualism was due to the fact that it appeared to offer credible evidence of personal survival after death. The strange phenomena of mediums and their plausible messages from the dead fascinated and consoled many who felt convinced that here, at last, was tangible proof that their loved ones continued to live on in other spheres; the avidity with which people seized upon such solace was also, certainly, a reflection of the intense longing for surety of another life.

It is this longing that has been exploited by priestcraft. The chief hold of religions and churches over their followers is a pretended revelation in respect to these mysteries. Then, since both heaven and hell are said to be eternal, considerable fear is aroused—and can easily be manipulated by priestcraft.

Here we may pause to note that one of the marked differences between the theosophic teachings regarding the after-death states and those of religions and spiritualism is in regard to their duration. Theosophy teaches that such states are temporary, whereas the dogmas of both the Christian churches and of Spiritualism hold that they are never-ending, whether of bliss or of suffering. Once we posit the fact of reincarnation, then the period between successive re-embodiments must necessarily be limited. Spiritualists, the Theosophist feels, are misled in this respect, due either to denial of the truth of reincarnation or to the ignorance of the correct teaching of reincarnation. The latter confusion is commented upon on pages 191-2 of the *Key to Theosophy:*

> At the time that work [*Isis Unveiled*] was written, re-incarnation was not believed in by any Spiritualists, either English or American, and what is said there of *re-incarnation* was directed against the

> French Spiritists, whose theory was as unphilosophical and absurd as the Eastern teaching is logical and self-evident in its truth. The Re-incarnationists of the Allan Kardec School believe in an arbitrary and immediate re-incarnation. With them, the dead father can incarnate in his own unborn daughter, and so on. They have neither Devachan, Karma, nor any philosophy that would warrant or prove the necessity of consecutive re-births. But how can the author of "Isis" argue against *Karmic* re-incarnation, at long intervals varying between 1,000 and 1,500 years, when it is the fundamental belief of both Buddhists and Hindus?

Spiritualists rely upon what their "Spirits" tell them, and these "Spirits" are often as much at loggerheads with one another as are poor mortals. In the words of the *Key* (p. 192):

> Truth is one; and when we hear the French spooks preaching re-incarnation, and the English spooks denying and denouncing the doctrine, we say that either the French or the English "Spirits" do not know what they are talking about. We believe with the Spiritualists and the Spiritists in the existence of "Spirits," or invisible Beings endowed with more or less intelligence. But, while in our teachings their kinds and *genera* are legion, our opponents admit of no other than human disembodied "Spirits," which, to our knowledge, are mostly Kamalokic SHELLS.

A caution to be kept in mind in our study of the states after death and, indeed, a caution to be considered in connection with all Theosophical tenets—is never to view these states in isolation or as unrelated to the rest of the philosophy. In Theosophy there are no isolated concepts, for the very genius of Theosophy is unity, synthesis, and interdependence in every direction. This is the philosophic basis of the great ethical principle of Universal Brotherhood. The post-mortem states of consciousness cannot be understood except in the light of EGOIC reincarnation and its governing law—Karma. This broad perspective tends to protect us from the danger of involvement in those purely terrestrial kamalokic states, contact with which, even in thought, is highly infectious as long as there remains anything in our natures consubstantial with elements of these planes.

It is for this reason, perhaps, that the Teachers have not gone more into a description of these spheres than was absolutely necessary to illustrate some law or principle involved. It is mediums and lower psychics who are fond of indulging in lurid and alluring descriptions —much of it stemming from their own fertile imaginations—of their alleged clairvoyant explorations in the astral regions. In his *Ocean of*

Theosophy, in the chapter on Kamaloka, William Q. Judge wrote: "It is beyond the scope of this work to go into a description of all these degrees [of kamaloka], inasmuch as volumes would be needed to describe them, and then but few would understand." The Teachers sought only to impart the knowledge of laws and principles, and this is the significance of the Third Object of the Theosophical society: The investigation of the unexplained *laws* of nature and the psychical powers latent in man.

An important application of the teachings on the states after death is their immediate bearing upon our everyday life. For there can be no sharp line of demarcation between what men call life and death, so far as the *inner* life of the EGO is concerned. Mr. Judge plainly implied this in the *Ocean* when he wrote, in the chapter on Kamaloka:

> We must also go back to the subject of the fourth principle of the constitution of man, that called Kama in Sanscrit and desire or passion in English. Bearing in mind what was said about that principle, and also the teaching with respect to the astral body and the Astral Light, it will be easier to understand what is taught about the two states, *ante* and *post mortem.*

In the chapter on Kama, Mr. Judge wrote: "This fourth principle is the balance principle of the whole seven. It stands in the middle, and from it the ways go up or down." Some of the deeper implications involving the Kamic principle and the state known as Kamaloka are contained in the concluding paragraph of Chapter VI:

> A fuller treatment of the fourth principle of our constitution would compel us to consider all such questions as those presented by the wonder workers of the east, by spiritualistic phenomena, hypnotism, apparitions, insanity, and the like, but they must be reserved for separate handling.

In order that the exposition of the states after death may become a practical and ever-available means of spiritual growth, we have to correlate all the ideas in these chapters as well as in the philosophy as a whole. Only in this way will intellectual statements of doctrine be converted into vital truths.

How are we to transform the speculative doctrine or theoretical knowledge into Yoga doctrine—or practical, devotional effort—by means of which "thou shalt forever burst the bonds of Karma and rise above them"? It is by means of *thought,* for mind is the real plane of action. In his article, "Universal Applications of Doctrine," Mr. Judge

correlates the teachings on the states after death with our daily and hourly thinking:

> But what of its [Reincarnation, Devachan, and Karma] hourly and daily application? If we believe in the doctrine of the One Life, then every cell in these material bodies must be governed by the same laws. Each cell must be a *life* and have its karma, devachan, and reincarnation. Every one of these cells upon incarnating among the others in our frame must be affected by the character of those it meets; and we make that character. Every thought upon reaching its period dies. It is soon reborn, and coming back from its devachan it finds either bad or good conpanions provided for it. Therefore every hour of our life is fraught with danger or with help. How can it be possible that a few hours a week devoted to theosophic thought and action can counter-act—even in the gross material cells—the effect of nearly a whole week spent in indifference, frivolity, or selfishness? This mass of poor or bad thought will form a resistless tide that shall sweep away all your good resolves at the first opportunity.
>
> This will explain why devoted students often fail. They have waited for a particular hour or day to try their strength, and when the hour came they had none. If it was anger they resolved to conquer, instead of trying to conquer it at an offered opportunity they ran away from the chance so as to escape the trial; or they did not meet the hourly small trials that would, if successfully passed, have given them a great reserve of strength, so that no time of greater trial would have been able to overcome them. (THEOSOPHY 41: 52.)

Thoughts not only have their devachan and incarnate again in human minds, but they also have their kamaloka, if, fraught with passion and selfishness, they can soar no higher. These kamalokic thoughts also incarnate and generally draw after them a like dark and ugly retinue, which finds lodgement, not only in the mind that generated them in the first instance, but also in any congenial mental and psychic soil. All these thoughts affect the *lives* of man's physical, astral, and mental sheaths and principles. According to the quality of the thoughts, so will be the impress upon the lives. Universal and altruistic thought and action spiritualize and raise the *lives* of our instruments; personal and selfish thought and action coarsen and lower them. The result is that a continuous conflict of war is set up in our very members and the elements making up our principles, the complement and reflection of the greater, primary war between the Higher and the Lower Self, or, between Buddhi-Manas and Kama-Manas. Kurukshetra, the body and battlefield, is also actively involved in the Great War, for it is a *living* battlefield, every atom of which is stirred to action by the major con-

flict, becoming a participant on one side or the other. This idea is contained in *The Voice of the Silence*: "For now the last great fight, the final war between the Higher and the Lower Self, hath taken place. Behold the very battlefield is now engulfed in the great war, and is no more."

The infectious power of even a passing thought is pointed out by Mr. Judge in his article, "Culture of Concentration":

> Some day we will begin to see why not one passing thought may be ignored, not one flitting impression missed. This we can perceive is no simple task. It is a gigantic work. Did you ever reflect that the mere passing sight of a picture, or a single word instantly lost in the rush of the world, may be basis for a dream that will poison the night and react upon the brain the next day. Each one must be examined. If you have not noticed it, then when you awake next day you have to go back in memory over every word and circumstance of the preceding day, seeking, like the astronomer through space, for the lost one. And, similarly, without such a special reason, you must learn to be able to thus go backward into your days so as to go over carefully and in detail all that happened, all that you have permitted to pass through the brain. Is this an easy matter? (THEOS. 34: 335.)

In the light of this passage we can better understand and appreciate the Precept: "For, on Path fourth, the lightest breeze of passion or desire will stir the steady light upon the pure white walls of Soul. . . . a thought as fleeting as the lightning flash will make thee thy three prizes forfeit—the prizes thou hast won." The universe exhibits a law of continuity which binds together all things and events whether on this visible physical plane, or on invisible metaphysical spheres. Continuity is implicit in the very law of Karma itself, for the operation of this law presents an unbroken and endless series of causal relationships. There are no hiatuses, missing links, gaps, or isolated events anywhere. The states after death, the states of consciousness during sleep, and our daily and hourly waking thoughts, feelings and deeds are all interlinked and act and react upon one another. It is the Immortal Divine Ego which is common to all these states and conditions. It is this EGO which is the central point from which all these states emerged, around and towards which they all gravitate, and upon which is hung their ultimate meaning and destiny.

A better understanding of the states after death may be had by a familiar correspondence and analogy—that of the states of consciousness during sleep. Not only do the states we pass through during

sleep help in the understanding of the states after death, but the reverse is also true: the teachings regarding the dream state, and the far more interior or dreamless state of consciousness become much clearer in the light of doctrines concerning states after death. The dreamless state of consciousness is so called because the divine consciousness of the Higher and Immortal Ego is then fully awake, and functions untrammeled by the lower, mortal instruments—the body, brain, astral body, and the kamic principle. Thus it is "dreamless" only so far as the lower man is concerned. Some dreams are the reflections and distortions in and on the sleeper's brain of the thoughts and actions of the Immortal Ego—reflections which are more or less confused by the imperfections in the lower instruments. The purer the instruments and the more porous the brain, the less distorted and truer will be our dreams, for all dreams whose source is the Higher Ego contain instruction and messages for the welfare, the guidance, and the protection of the Personal Man.

This analogy between the states after death and those during sleep, which we find extensively treated in our present day theosophical literature both as a means of instruction and of inner growth, has probably been employed by the Teachers in all ages. On page 163 of the *Key to Theosophy*: "In some Upanishad these recurrent re-births are likened to the life of a mortal which oscillates periodically between sleep and waking." In the *Voice of the Silence,* which is derived from the *Book of the Golden Precepts,* which forms part of the same series as that from which the "Stanzas" of the *Book of Dzyan* were taken, the waking and the states of consciousness during sleep are referred to in connection with the Three Halls, which "lead to the end of toils." These Halls will bring the Pilgrim through three states into the fourth, "and thence into the seven worlds, the Worlds of Rest Eternal." A footnote defines the "three states": "The three states of consciousness, which are *Jagrat,* the waking; *Svapna,* the dreaming; and *Sushupti,* the deep sleeping state." These three states are referred to as Yogi conditions, showing that they are the well-recognized means of inner growth, the preliminary and indispensable steps leading to a still higher state: "The *Turiya,* that beyond the dreamless state, the one above all, a state of high spiritual consciousness." The significance of these states was made the subject of an article by William Q. Judge, "The Three Planes of Human Life" (THEOSOPHY 29: 463). At some time in a man's evolution, he must take the steps to final attainment, and, "Among those

steps are an acquaintance with and understanding of the three steps first spoken of." We quote a few passages bearing on their nature:

> Every theosophist who is in earnest ought to know the importance of these three states, and especially how essential it is that one should not lose in Swapna the memory of experiences in Sushupti, nor in Jagrata those of Swapna, and *vice versâ.*
>
> Jagrata, our waking state, is the one in which we must be regenerated; where we must come to a full consciousness of the Self within, for in no other state is salvation possible. . . .
>
> Jagrata acts on Swapna, producing dreams and suggestions, and either disturbs the instructions that come down from the higher state or aids the person through waking calmness and concentration which tend to lessen the distortions of the mental experiences of dream life. Swapna again in its turn acts on the waking state (Jagrata) by the good or bad suggestions made to him in dreams. All experience and all religions are full of proofs of this. . . . In Job it is said that God instructeth man in sleep, in dreams, and in visions of the night. And the common introspective and dream life of the most ordinary people needs no proof. Many cases are within my knowledge where the man was led to commit acts against which his better nature rebelled, the suggestion for the act coming to him in dream. It was because the unholy state of his waking thoughts infected his dreams, and laid him open to evil influences. By natural action and reaction he poisoned both Jagrata and Swapna.
>
> It is therefore our duty to purify and keep clear these two planes.
>
> The third state common to all is *Sushupti,* which has been translated *"dreamless sleep."* The translation is inadequate, for, while it is dreamless, it is also a state in which even criminals commune through the higher nature with spiritual beings and enter into the spiritual plane. It is the great spiritual reservoir by means of which the tremendous momentum toward evil living is held in check. . . .
>
> So it appears, then, that what he should try to accomplish is such a clearing up and vivification of Swapna state as shall result in removing the confusion and distortion existing there, in order that upon emerging into waking life he may retain a wider and brighter memory of what occurred in Sushupti. This is done by an increase of concentration upon high thought, upon noble purposes, upon all that is best and most spiritual in him while awake. The best result cannot be accomplished in a week or a year, perhaps not in a life, but, once begun, it will lead to the perfection of spiritual cultivation in some incarnation hereafter. . . . For by this way, as by the spider's small thread, we may gain the free space of spiritual life.

The states during sleep have been employed with good effect in *The Key to Theosophy* to show their correspondence with the states

after death; and particularly in connection with a tenet with which the *Key* deals quite extensively, namely, the doctrine, that under certain conditions, the after-death existence of the *personality* may be a total blank as far as consciousness is concerned. Three kinds of sleep are spoken of, and these correspond to three kinds of post-mortem existence. On page 165, H.P.B. wrote:

> The Ego receives always according to its deserts. After the dissolution of the body, there commences for it a period of full awakened consciousness, or a state of chaotic dreams, or an utterly dreamless sleep undistinguishable from annihilation, and these are the three kinds of sleep. If our physiologists find the cause of dreams and visions in an unconscious preparation for them during the waking hours, why cannot the same be admitted for the *post-mortem* dreams? I repeat it: *death is sleep*. After death, before the spiritual eyes of the soul, begins a performance according to a programme learnt and very often unconsciously composed by ourselves: the practical carrying out of *correct* beliefs or of illusions which have been created by ourselves.

There is a vast difference between the terrestrial "I" of the personality, and the spiritual "I," the Monad and individuality. There is no immortality for the personality as such. The lower Self must believe in, strive after, and win his immortality. "Your spiritual 'I'," wrote H.P.B., "is immortal; but from your present self it can carry away to Eternity that only which has become worthy of immortality, namely, the aroma alone of the flower that has been mown by death" (p. 166). This idea is again emphasized (p. 169):

> No materialist, however unbelieving, can die for ever in the fulness of his spiritual individuality. What was said is that consciousness can disappear either fully or partially in the case of a materialist, so that no conscious remains of his personality survive.

To the question, "But surely this is annihilation?" the answer is given:

> Certainly not. One can sleep a dead sleep and miss several stations during a long railway journey, without the slightest recollection or consciousness, and wake at another station and continue the journey past innumerable other halting-places till the end of the journey or the goal is reached. Three kinds of sleep were mentioned to you: the dreamless, the chaotic, and the one which is so real, that to the sleeping man his dreams become full realities. If you believe in the latter why can't you believe in the former; according to the after life a man has believed in and expected, such is the life he will have. He who expected no life to come will have an absolute blank, amount-

> ing to annihilation, in the interval between the two re-births. This is just the carrying out of the programme we spoke of, a programme created by the materialists themselves. But there are various kinds of materialists, as you say. A selfish, wicked Egoist, one who never shed a tear for anyone but himself, thus adding entire indifference to the whole world to his unbelief, must, at the threshold of death, drop his personality for ever. This personality having no tendrils of sympathy for the world around and hence nothing to hook on to Sutratma, it follows that with the last breath every connection between the two is broken.

H.P.B. elsewhere reverts to the correspondence between sleep and death (p. 180):

> Of that which falls under our sensuous perceptions only what grows directly from, or is attached to this invisible root above [the Ego which incarnates], can partake of its immortal life. Hence every noble thought, idea and aspiration of the personality it informs, proceeding from and fed by this root, must become permanent. As to the physical consciousness, as it is a quality of the sentient but lower "principle," (Kama-rupa or animal instinct, illuminated by the lower *manasic* reflection), or the human Soul—it must disappear. That which displays activity, while the body is asleep or paralysed, is the higher consciousness, our memory registering but feebly and inaccurately—because automatically—such experiences, and often failing to be even slightly impressed by them.

Here the entire loss of consciousness for Kama-Manas after death is compared to the condition of Lower Manas in dreamless sleep or *Sushupti.* The Divine Ego is fully awake and active during dreamless sleep, but the personal man may be so obtuse and non-receptive that not even the slightest impress from the Higher Ego registers in the lower, sleeping mortal. The two other kinds of sleep—that marked by prophetic, vivid, clear and meaningful dreams, and that marked by chaotic and confused dreams—correspond to the states after death contained in the sentence on pages 161-162: "For the materialist, who, notwithstanding his materialism, was not a bad man, the interval between the two lives will be like the unbroken and placid sleep of a child, either entirely dreamless, or filled with pictures of which he will have no definite perception; while for the average mortal it will be a dream as vivid as life, and full of realistic bliss and visions."

The scientific and philosophical rationale of what Swedenborg called "Spiritual death" is explained on pages 189-191:

> This can in no way alter a fact in nature, if it be a fact, or prevent such a thing occasionally taking place. The universe and everything

in it, moral, mental, physical, psychic, or Spiritual, is built on a perfect law of equilibrium and harmony. As said before (*vide Isis Unveiled*), the centripetal force could not manifest itself without the centrifugal in the harmonious revolutions of the spheres, and all forms and their progress are the products of this dual force in nature. Now the Spirit (or *Buddhi*) is the centrifugal and the soul (*Manas*) the centripetal spiritual energy; and to produce one result they have to be in perfect union and harmony. Break or damage the centripetal motion of the earthly soul tending toward the centre which attracts it; arrest its progress by clogging it with a heavier weight of matter than it can bear, or than is fit for the Devachanic state, and the harmony of the whole will be destroyed. Personal life, or perhaps rather its ideal reflection, can only be continued if sustained by the two-fold force, that is by the close union of *Buddhi* and *Manas* in every re-birth or personal life. The least deviation from harmony damages it; and when it is destroyed beyond redemption the two forces separate at the moment of death. During a brief interval the *personal* form (called indifferently *Kama rupa* and *Mayavi rupa*), the spiritual efflorescence of which, attaching itself to the Ego, follows it into Devachan and gives to the permanent *individuality* its *personal* colouring (*pro. tem.,* so to speak), is carried off to remain in *Kamaloka* and to be gradually annihilated. For it is after the death of the utterly depraved, the unspiritual and the wicked beyond redemption, that arrives the critical and supreme moment. If during life the ultimate and desperate effort of the INNER SELF (*Manas*), to unite something of the personality with itself and the high glimmering ray of the divine Buddhi, is thwarted; if this ray is allowed to be more and more shut out from the ever-thickening crust of physical brain, the Spiritual EGO or Manas, once freed from the body, remains severed entirely from the ethereal relic of the personality; and the latter, or *Kama rupa,* following its earthly attractions, is drawn into and remains in *Hades,* which we call the *Kamaloka.* These are "the withered branches" mentioned by Jesus as being cut off from the *Vine.* Annihilation, however, is never instantaneous, and may require centuries sometimes for its accomplishment. But there the personality remains along with the *remnants* of other more fortunate personal Egos, and becomes with them a *shell* and an *Elementary.* As said in *Isis,* it is these two classes of "Spirits," the *shells* and the *Elementaries,* which are the leading "Stars" on the great spiritual stage of "materialisations." And you may be sure of it, it is not they who incarnate; and, therefore, so few of these "dear departed ones" know anything of re-incarnation, misleading thereby the Spiritualists.

Before concluding this study we shall endeavor to see what Theosophy declares to be the ultimate nature and essence of Immortality, bearing in mind the distinction between imperishability and immortal-

ity. "Every atom and speck of matter, not of substance only, is *imperishable* in its essence, but not in its *individual consciousness.* Immortality is one's unbroken consciousness." There are two views or ideals extant on the nature of immortality. One ideal is immortal existence in a purely subjective sphere. This view holds that the purpose of objective and terrestrial life is to prepare one for immortal, subjective, ideal existence—its great and ultimate *reward.* The other view and ideal is the exact reverse of this. It holds that *a conscious existence in Spirit* may and can be experienced on any plane, even on this the most differentiated plane of matter—the terrestrial.

These two divergent views on immortality and the final goal of existence result in, or rather, are, the reflections of two opposite *lines of motive.* In one case, the reason and motive for the active periods of existence is final bliss and rest; in the other case, rest in the primeval state of homogeneity is for the purpose of assimilation of the experiences of the Manvantaric cycle, and preparation for wider participation in the succeeding period of manifestation. The Arhat who has renounced Nirvana is not thereby deprived of the power to experience that state. He has attained to immortality "on both sides of death." A footnote in the *Voice* states: "The *fourth* Path is known as that of *Rahat* or *Arhat.* This is the highest. An Arhat sees Nirvana during his life. For him it is no *post-mortem* state, but *Samadhi,* during which he experiences all Nirvanic bliss." The "immortality" of the selfish Nirvanee comes to an end, because Nirvana is not truly Eternal, but lasts only for the remainder of that Manvantara and the following period of Pralaya—a total period lasting trillions of our years. But the longest period "is like a wink of the Eye of Self-Existence," and at the next period of manifestation, the Nirvanee must start again near the bottom of the ladder of evolution. The Buddha of Compassion has attained to true, eternal immortality of a conscious existence in Spirit. He so exists even though the exigencies of evolution and the needs of his younger brothers require the assumption of bodies of flesh and blood.

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

SOME of the chief aspects of the Three Fundamentals of Theosophy (such as Reincarnation, the Source-Principle, Perfected Beings, etc.) have not been widely considered in terms of scientific thought. A chief stumbling block, it seems, is the "extra-physical" character of these postulates in conflict with the current ideas as to the nature of proper evidence. What can be said of the theosophic and/or occult nature of evidence and proof as contrasted with the empirical scientific method in vogue?

A close look at the empirical methods so dear to the heart of modern science reveals an interesting dilemma. The investigator believes that through the process of induction, the subjective influence upon his work is eliminated. Though he may look with scorn upon any thought derived from a personal realization or an intuitive grasp of the truth, in actuality, the scientist is no better off than his "philosophizing" opposite.

Numerous observations are made, always with the scientist trying to reduce the personal equation (error introduced by the observer himself) to zero. A statistically significant number of observations must be obtained in order that the conclusions drawn will be valid. Three alternatives of procedure are then possible. The scientist may try to fit the results he has obtained into a mathematical equation, which is nothing more than a concise way of saying that if such and such are done or observed, results are expected to occur according to the given relationship. Or, the investigator may see that he has a number of observational results. After looking at them for a period of time, he perhaps thinks that they show evidence of a law in nature. When he believes he has determined what the law is, he then proceeds to test his hypothesis to see if he can predict results accurately. If after sufficient testing the hypothesis proves itself, it becomes a theory, and after final and conclusive verification, a law. The third alternative must be taken eventually by anyone who really desires to understand the motivation of any phenomenon. The investigator must ask the origin of "law." Here he has no place to turn but within. No matter how obvious the facts may be, only with interpretations of the mind do they take on any value.

No observer can be completely "objective." All the messages and impulses he receives must pass through the mind and be interpreted to some extent. We can be unaffected only by things that we completely understand. While the process of learning is going on, we have no way of knowing whether we have unconsciously excluded some pertinent data. The materialistic scientist may then perhaps build a machine to do his observing. However, the machine is only as complete and as objective as the mind which creates it. Science cannot remove the human element, the extra-physical, from its work.

We might ask what actually constitutes a proof of a physical law. It certainly is not the result of physical observation and conclusion. You cannot prove a law to someone else, no matter how comprehensive the data, unless the individual is willing to accept it. In the final analysis it is the mind, the inner man, which arrives at all the conclusions. We can only measure facts and obtain understanding from our own knowledge and experience.

Thus we see that materialistic science in its attempt to be undogmatic and accept only that which has been properly proved on the physical plane, is itself making a much larger and more dogmatic claim than the philosopher or occultist ever did. The Wisdom Religion has always postulated that all knowledge is gained by the individual soul's penetration into, and assimilation of, the great laws of nature. Only through soul experience on all planes of being is real understanding gained. Final proof is but the light of nature shining through to the soul within.

It is interesting to note that science, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, was forced to assume a metaphysical basis for all physical phenomena.

For one who is trying to live a mental life rather than one chiefly composed of emotional reactions, the striving to view every situation from a rational and mental standpoint is constant. Yet in the very process of living, we often have dealings, and at times intimate contact, with people who will not or cannot think and act reasonably or mentally when the situation involves themselves to any great degree. In such circumstances, we might very well find that in order to prevent an injustice from occurring, we have to deal with that person with force rather than with reason—at least use psychological or, perhaps, legal force—as that seems to be all he can understand. There must be some

way, though, in which we can act without having to resort to such means as indicated.

(*a*) Every human being has the power to choose, and, therefore, to reason. However, in certain situations a person can be very confused and unable to see "any way in or out," and may refuse to think. Then, by trying to *put one's self in the position of that person,* it is often possible to clear up the confusion of this person without making the decision for him, just helping him to see clearly what the facts are, and then he himself can decide what to do or not to do. Sometimes we may have to refuse to co-operate with someone, and, if he depends on us, he will regard this as a form of coërcion, but it is not really so. There are cases wherein sympathy and reason have been tried over and over again without any positive results, and it may have gone so far that an injustice simply has to be prevented. For example, parents often have to face situations where they know better than their child what the right thing to do *is.* So they are forced to resort to the means indicated in the question, because they are responsible for the child and also for the child's actions. Then it is not an "evil" to use psychological or legal force.

Perhaps the only legitimate use of corporal punishment is as a means of getting the attention of the child focused on the problem at hand insofar as he is capable of viewing it. It may be a means of helping him to regain a hold on himself, so that he may not lose the present opportunity of increasing his understanding of himself and his environment.

Although the parent must assume the role of teacher to the child, he is also the one who is in constant contact with the child. The appeal to the mind of the child as an awakening power is primary, but it is not always wise to punish the child through the mind. A child lives in his mind and feelings, and if he feels insecure there he may develop blocks to understanding. Often the best and least complicated punishment that the child can understand is some form of corporal punishment. If he is learning that he is not his body, he will for a time think he is his feelings and mind.

Of course, the reason for the punishment is important, too. A child is really quite at the mercy of the adult and feels it. If he feels it only physically and not mentally, then he can outgrow that. But if a child feels that he can't compete mentally with the parent, he feels just that much more defenseless and weak. Usually helpful is the saying "There

is a time and place for everything," and at certain ages one kind of approach may be best for a certain child, and later on another is best.

To deal with a person with force does not mean dealing without reason, for in some cases it is the only means left and therefore also has its place. It really depends on the situation. One time it might be the only thing to do, and another time, it can be avoided by more understanding. So there is no rule to follow in every situation. We just have to figure out, ourselves, by reason, if we have to act that way.

(*b*) This question aims at a sore spot in our present culture. Its solution was but one of the objectives of the present Theosophical Movement, namely to present a logical basis for action and to postulate a universal Law.

We might say that the refrain of the unthinking man of the time is, "Why did it have to happen to me? I didn't do anything. Why couldn't it happen to someone else?" Often, the emotional outburst, for whatever cause, may be followed with a desire by the sufferer to strike out at the world, or at whoever happens to be within range.

All these actions are manifestations of man's lower nature, his selfishness. Everyone can readily see the cause of injustice to others, or at least maintain an objective attitude, but when it comes to himself, he can't or won't acknowledge it. It gives the personal man satisfaction to feel that others are hurt, too.

What can be done to prevent injustice, and at the same time help the sufferer to find an answer to his cry? Perhaps immediate force to stop an injustice is proper at the time. The slow process of awakening the thinking powers in man may have to come later. Then, too, by our intervention, we might at other times interrupt the learning of an important lesson.

Only the individual can make the decision for himself as to the proper course of action to be taken. Neither answer of itself is absolutely right. In one instance we may be stooping to the emotional level ourselves, thus showing that we haven't conquered our own weakness. On the other hand, Arjuna is persuaded to use force to conquer emotions. In any event, by dealing with the individual as he is, perhaps using analogy to find some common ground of experience, and thus drawing the soul away from the altogether personal, we may help the irrational individual to see the basic gaps in his thinking.

The equal-minded adept illustrates the attitude to work *toward* at all times.

"FREE OF HIS KEYBOARD"

JNANASAKTI, the power of intellect, of real wisdom or knowledge, is one of the six primary forces in Nature—synthesized by the Seventh, or the Whole. Like all other powers and forces in the Universe, *Jnanasakti* is subject to the law of duality, and hence has two aspects: first, those manifestations of thought or mind activity that result when the intellect is placed under the influence of material conditions: second, those that result when the power of intellect is freed from the material influence—that is to say, when it is liberated from the bonds of matter. Every human being uses *Jnanasakti,* either in its higher or lower aspect, throughout the whole of his lifetime—and this whether he be conscious of the fact or not. Being ignorant, however, of its true nature, and of the principle of duality by which it operates, men in general are not in control of their powers, in which case they operate automatically, tending gradually toward the lower, more material, side of existence. It is for this reason perhaps—that is, because of *un*-control—that men fail to reach up to their highest possibilities.

Some of the lower, encumbered manifestations of *Jnanasakti* are memory and anticipation, the power to interpret sensations, and even the ability, with the help of memory and the "law of association," to generate the notion of self or individuality. Some of its higher, non-encumbered manifestations, when intellect is liberated from the bonds of matter, are clairvoyance and psychometry—the former being the faculty of seeing through the densest matter, irrespective of either time or distance, while the latter implies the ability to read or see, not with the physical eyes, but with the sight of the Soul.

Rare is the individual who, in any one lifetime, succeeds in liberating *Jnanasakti* from its lower, materialistic bonds. Or, to use a phrase common in the world of music among pianists, rare is the artist who succeeds in getting "free of his keyboard." Who has not had the experience of listening to a rendition of Chopin or Bach which, though perfect by every known rule of harmony and composition, was nevertheless lifeless, as though weighted with lead? Where is the æsthete who has not sought in despair for the soul-satisfying element missing in some work of art? And where is the craftsman, painter, writer, speaker,

who has not striven in vain, at times, to lift his talent above the dull, dead weight of technique?

A large percentage of the mediocrity of this age, it may be, is due to the fact that *Jnanasakti* is allowed to operate almost exclusively under the influence or control of material conditions. It matters not, in the exercise of this power, what one's talent or profession in life may be. Every individual has his "keyboard" or that which corresponds to it. Every human being is surrounded, in one way or another, by certain material qualities or conditions through which he must of necessity work—for the soul, on this plane, requires an instrument for its expression. The tragedy occurs only when this fact is overlooked, when one forgets that he *is* a soul, and identifies *himself* with the vehicle or vesture through which he acts. Self-identifying attachment of the soul with the body, says the *Bhagavad-Gita,* is the primary cause of all imperfection, as well as of all ignorance, sorrow and despair.

> The devotee who knows the divine truth thinketh "I am doing nothing" in seeing, hearing, touching, smelling, eating, moving, sleeping, breathing; even when speaking, letting go or taking, opening or closing his eyes, he sayeth, "the senses and organs move by natural impulse to their appropriate objects."

Bearing in mind the two-fold nature of *Jnanasakti,* and the possibility latent in man of lifting the intellect above the purgations of matter, students of the *Gita* will better appreciate Krishna's teachings with respect to Yoga, or union with the Self. "Equal-mindedness," he states, "is called Yoga," and "Yoga is skill in the performance of actions." It is not possible, according to this teaching, to be truly skillful, or to bring through the genius of the soul, so long as mind is entirely wrapped up in the outward act of doing. Can a typist be considered truly skillful who still has to look at the keys?

Is the motorist an expert driver who is still conscious of each motion of control he exerts? Can men or women in any field do their best work until they have acquired such facility of action that they are free to take their minds off the instruments or machines through which they operate? Having once trained the conscious, semi-intelligent lives in the body to do their work, they are best left to themselves for the further workmanlike prosecution of their tasks. Once the senses and organs have become habituated to their respective duties, self-identification of mind with them only leads to confusion and consequent loss.

Jnanasakti, operating under the influence of matter, therefore, is a drag upon the spiritual evolution of the race. An example of this is seen in the use or mis-use of memory. Thought by many to belong to the higher faculties of mind, memory, according to *The Secret Doctrine,* is one of its lower, encumbered manifestations. It serves more often to inhibit than to express the nobler qualities of the soul. Speakers and lecturers, in their dependence upon memory, provide a striking example of the difficulty experienced by men in freeing themselves of their keyboards and of rising to the plane of real thought. As the child who is learning to swim fears to lift his feet from the bottom, so lecturers and orators oftentimes lack the courage to let go of memory, or of notes. Thus fearful and distrustful of the Self within, the intellect becomes bound by matter, is subservient to form, and depends for its inspiration upon the brain-mind recollection of what other people have thought or said. Is it any wonder, then, that information has come to take the place of knowledge, and that the ability to repeat the words of others is more highly prized than the power to think for oneself? If the child only knew it, the buoyancy of the ocean would support his faltering frame. With equal certainty would the buoyancy of Soul, which is an ocean of knowledge, sustain the principle of mind and intellect—if only men had the courage to trust it.

The use of notes and of prepared recitations, framed and formulated in advance of the event, while providing the speaker with a certain feeling of personal security, almost completely represses any urge of the intuition to make itself felt *at the moment.* And it is only in the moment, in the living eternal NOW, that the spontaneous Soul consents to proclaim its oracles. Deity, or Soul, is conscious of neither past nor future, but only of the eternal Present, and hence cannot be committed to, nor in any way bound by, the premeditated and fixed declarations of men.

> The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but cannot tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth. So is every one that is born of the Spirit. (St. John 3:8.)

And so it is with the voice of man's inner God, or intuition—no one can tell whence it comes, or whither it goes. A certain amount of brain-mind training and preparation is undoubtedly necessary for the highest perfection in the practice of any of the arts. But the individual who prepares *himself,* morally and spiritually, who assumes the position of trust in the Soul, is far more likely to receive help from the inner

side of being than one who trusts in brain power alone. That such help and inspiration is received by men is evidenced by the fact that work done by those who depend upon their own inherent power to express what they know is usually far more inspiring and convincing than that of those who memorize, copy, or imitate, however perfect *in form* the latter expressions may be.

Jnanasakti, un-encumbered by matter—that is to say, by fixity in thought or expression—possesses a genius of its own. Given proper conditions of mind and heart through which to operate, it reaches into the region of the higher mind and brings into manifestation the wisdom and beneficence of the Soul. It is this ray of Higher Mind, of *Buddhi* focussed in *Manas,* that warms the hearts of men, and gives splendor and character to everything that they do. It is this inner spontaneity which is the ensouling quality of great literature and art. The individual who has it, or has learned to reach up to it, has attained to Yoga, or union with God, and finds at his command all knowledge. Such an individual, at least for the moment, is "free of his keyboard." Without effort to remember, he knows all that he needs to know.

Free and Voluntary

Virtue infers liberty, as the transport of a burden implies active force. With constraint there is no virtue, and without virtue no religion. Make me a slave and I shall be the worse for it.

The soul acts inwardly; its inward acts are thought, will, inclination, and an acquiescence in certain truths, all of which are above restraint; and it is for the ecclesiastical ministry to instruct, but not to command them.

The soul acts also outwardly. Its exterior acts are submission to the civil law; and here constraint may take place, and temporal or corporeal penalties may punish the violations of the law.

Obedience to the ecclesiastical order ought, consequently, to be always free and voluntary; it ought to exact no other. On the contrary, submission to the civil law may be enforced.

For the same reason ecclesiastical penalties, always being spiritual, attach in this world to those only who are inwardly convinced of their error.

—Voltaire

SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN THEOSOPHY

Science is nothing more or less than a well-tested method. If one follows this method, the results may be regarded as scientific.

—ISRAEL WECHLER, *The Neurologist's Point of View*

Science changes our values in two ways. It injects new ideas into the familiar culture. And it subjects it to the pressure of technical change . . . until the whole basis of our culture has imperceptibly been remade.

—J. BRONOWSKI, *The Common Sense of Science*

The unique end of science is not public utility and application to natural phenomena, but is the honor of the human spirit.

—K. G. J. JACOBI

THEOSOPHICAL literature teems with succinct phrases that lend themselves, almost irresistibly, to mantramic repetition; and, though a student may feel intuitively that they are "true," he must *think* on them and relate them to his experience if belief is to be transformed into rational conviction. Otherwise, the habit of glib repetition may lead the student into a situation in which he finds himself unable to support his statement logically and calmly in terms understandable by and acceptable to a non-Theosophist.

Take a familiar example: "Theosophy is not *a* science, but Science" —a statement probably *fully* understood by but few Theosophists. H. P. Blavatsky wrote the whole of *The Secret Doctrine* in support of that assertion. Is the ordinary student capable of writing such a book? Apparently not! But he can, at least, place the affirmation in an understandable context, such as might be suggested by the following definitions:

Science is a well-tested method, the results of which introduce new ideas into the culture, thereby changing it.

Theosophy is a body of ideas, stemming from three fundamental propositions and integral to them; and a method of utilizing them which profoundly affects the human spirit.

To begin with, in order to establish our "non-sectarian" position, we need to offer some basis for the assertion that Theosophy conforms to the scientific method. Indeed, ancient, or "occult" science (represented today by Theosophy) has always considered this method the ideal approach to discovery—as H.P.B. made clear in *S.D.* I, 272:

> This system of ancient cosmogony . . . is the uninterrupted record covering thousands of generations of Seers whose respective experiences were made to test and to verify the traditions passed orally by one early race to another. . . . How did they do so? By checking, testing, and verifying in every department of nature the traditions of old by the independent visions of great adepts. . . . No vision of one adept was accepted till it was checked and confirmed by the visions—so obtained as to stand as independent evidence—of other adepts, and by centuries of experiences.

This is a clear and unequivocal description of the scientific *method,* whether or not our listener gives credence to the "facts." Ways of meeting objections to the assumed existence of "adept-seers" will, of course, depend upon the situation; but any Theosophist may point out that the fundamental propositions of Theosophy are properly accepted by the student "on a level with the 'working hypotheses' so freely accepted by modern science." (*S.D.* I, viii.) For although a student cannot test the cosmic range of these propositions, he *can* test the principles involved—in his environment, in his nature, and with his present powers of observation and analysis.

In order to test further the statement that "Theosophy is Science," we must consider some theosophical ideas in relation to their results on culture—or, as Theosophists express it, the "race-mind." If these ideas offered by Theosophy *have* been injected into the race-mind and have thereby changed the culture, Theosophy at least parallels the function of science in this direction.

One of the most notable changes in approach has been in the realm of physics. In 1888, when these Theosophic ideas were first made available to the world, matter was considered to be a "solid," and man and the universe were assumed to work like machines, *i.e.,* a *co-ordination* of parts and forces. But H. P. Blavatsky stated that the universe and everything in it forms an intelligent, dynamic whole, and much of *The Secret Doctrine* is in support of that categorical assertion. Those persons immediately amenable to these ideas were, or became, Theosophists; others, especially those whose beliefs were vulnerable, ridiculed the ideas; still others apparently ignored them. But such ideas could not long be ignored, for Theosophists kept them alive in mind, and spread them abroad at every opportunity. Thus, these "strange" conceptions gradually osmosed into the more open minds, so that now we find ramifications or adaptations of ideas, originally theosophic, returning to us in the language of the various fields

of scientific exploration and experimentation: the "atomic unity" of the universe and man, matter as a "form of energy," space-time relativity, nuclear physics, *et al.*—mere words to most of us, but serving to indicate a certain level of scientific formulation. In short, the scientific mind now considers the universe and man to be an *integration of forces,* a dynamic "organism." So one must, if he be a "scientific" historian, give credit to H.P.B. as being the nineteenth-century discoverer of these ancient, though officially only recently-accepted, "scientific" truths.

Most noticeable, perhaps, of the effects of theosophic thought are the absorption into the general vocabulary of the words "karma" and "reincarnation," and the increased insistence on universal brotherhood. Even though the philosophic explanation of karma and reincarnation may be largely ignored or imperfectly grasped, the words themselves are so frequently encountered in writing and conversation that they no longer produce either a start of surprise or a snort of derision. And, while the humanitarian may lack the conviction that brotherhood is an actual fact in nature, individuals in ever-increasing numbers are dedicating themselves to the *ideal* of the brotherhood of man and are endeavoring to bring it into actuality. This, we may believe, is a result in which theosophic thought has played a significant part.

Theosophists have also, without doubt, been instrumental in breaking down categorical rigidities of good and evil, right and wrong—interpretations based on the Ten Commandments and the Mosaic Law. Good and evil, said H.P.B., are *relative*—relative to times, cultures, circumstances, and individuals. "Judge the act, but not the person," an injunction familiar to Theosophists, has become the procedure in the field of social psychology, most noticeable, perhaps, in studies dealing with juvenile delinquency.

In some of the literature of general psychology and psychiatry, moreover, we find the word "soul" being used to designate a dynamic center of choice and responsibility, a potential *creator* of better personal relationships through self-understanding and self-directed improvement. It is indeed a good thing that the theological implications of the soul as a gift of God have been lost, even though the concept of the soul as a vague psychic entity sometimes takes its place: certainly, the latter is much nearer the theosophical concept of soul than the former. Also, several of the more philosophic psychoanalysts use "soul" in a

way that is not at all antagonistic to the idea of an enduring moral self. Can we imagine that the thousands of Theosophists whose tradition it is to think of themselves and others as souls in evolution, and who strive to act from that basis, have *not* had a great effect on their culture?

These few instances, then, among others that might be equally apt, show the similarity of method and identity of function in Theosophy and science. "True science," says H.P.B., "is never at odds with Theosophy": each seeks to discover "truth," and through truth to free the minds of men. Yet, it is not to be wondered at if the time-lag between the publication of *The Secret Doctrine* and the "new" science suggests to Theosophists that Theosophy *first* "injected new ideas" into the scientific minds of our time which have now seeped through scientific channels "into the familiar culture."

The *proof* of Theosophy, of course, lies in the continuous testing of its propositions by application and extension. Each person so testing may eventually be able to assert from his own knowledge: Theosophy is not *a* science, but Science—the Science of Life.

The Necessary Undoing

The remedy for Ignorance is Knowledge or Awareness. It goes without saying that by Knowledge is meant something more than ordinary discursive knowledge. Liberation is not to be compassed by attending courses at the university or by reading up manuals of philosophy. Rational knowledge makes its own useful contribution in helping to clear the ground of minor delusions; but Knowledge, the transcendent virtue by divine right, stands above Reason. It is the fruit of a direct intuitive experience, which is not so much a thing acquired by accretion; rather it is a thing that is already there from the moment that the obstacles to its realization have ceased to be. The effort of the seeker after this Real Knowledge is all along directed to the elimination of hindrances, to *allowing* the Knowledge to arise spontaneously, as it will do, the instant the necessary *undoing* has been effected. The presence of Knowledge is reflected in a radical alteration of the entire nature of a being; to know is to be, there is no other way.

—Marco Pallis

ON THE LOOKOUT

"THE DHAMMAPADA"

A new rendition of *The Dhammapada,* best known of Buddhist scriptures, is now available on all U.L.T. book tables, and may be ordered through The Theosophy Company, or from the publishers, The Cunningham Press, Alhambra, Calif. The Theosophical student through whose efforts this rendition was made is one who, it is clear, thoroughly appreciates the lucid diction of William Q. Judge's *Bhagavad-Gita,* and readers will value the references to *The Voice of the Silence* in the explanatory notes.

As Lookout remarked under the heading of "The Theosophy of Buddha" (in April), the present witnesses a world-wide renascence of respect for the teachings of Gotama. Psychologists, in particular, are gleaning some understanding of the essential wisdom contained in Eastern philosophy and religion as found in Buddhist precepts. The Foreword to this latest *Dhammapada* emphasizes this trend:

> After 2500 years, the teachings of Gotama Buddha are being regarded as "really quite modern." It would perhaps be less presumptuous and more true to say that the present growing-tips of Western psychology are now beginning to touch The Problem of Man where Buddha laid gentle but firm hand so long ago.
>
> Throughout the past fifty years, the relevance of Buddha's perceptions to a "science of soul" has become increasingly clear. This Indian sage, perhaps more than any other who has ever lived, provided a meeting-ground for all extremes of persuasion—gnosticism and agnosticism, belief and the skepticism of caution, appreciation of intuition, and devotion to logic. While the world of the mind is still quivering from abrupt change—transition from too much other-worldly religion to too much physical science—a man who recognized, as parts of a larger whole, the valid emphases of each, is a man whose thoughts are worth knowing today.

"PHILOSOPHICALLY VALUABLE AND PSYCHOLOGICALLY SOUND"

The publisher's Foreword continues, giving reasons for stressing the "balance" of Buddha's teachings:

> In the *Dhammapada,* while Buddha both affirms and denies some things with assurance, many verses also contain, in sequence, the *converse* of what is first said. We find, therefore, that the sharp delineations between "good" and "evil" which characterize familiar

religious forms, are supplanted by the establishment of a number of subtle ethical dimensions—presented in the form of "on the other hands" and "yes, buts." Now, it is clearly this very quality of the Buddha's thought, at once rendering its precepts philosophically valuable and psychologically sound, which arouses the admiration of Westerners.

Sentences from the last two pages of "The Downward Course" in the *Dhammapada* provide sufficient explanation: "They who discern evil where there is no evil (as well as) they who see nothing evil in what is evil—both enter the downward path, following false doctrines."

Religion and Science

In this brief passage we may well feel that the essential key to Buddha's outlook stands revealed: To speak of those whose trouble arises from failing to "discern evil" where there is evil—this is also the talk of church and temple. To speak of those whose trouble arises from "discerning evil" *where there is no evil,* who feel shame where there should be no shame—this is the language of psychotherapy. Clinicians of our time are still encountering warped psyches influenced by distorted conceptions of sin; Buddha had his own backlog of priestly distortion to face, and his "point, counterpoint" method of instruction, in perfect balance itself, encouraged balance in those who listened. "Evil" is not to be feared, in other words, but *understood,* which can in turn only be accomplished by penetrating beyond traditional categories of Right and Wrong. Do we, today, really need anything more desperately than to find a way of retaining ethical awareness while rejecting categorical morality—and its accompanying self-righteousness?

History of a Perspective

This work is presented to readers not as a mere "illustration" of Eastern religious philosophy, but as living literature of the heart doctrine. As the Foreword puts it:

> The present volume is especially meant for all those who aspire to brighten their day-to-day living, and who are seeking inspiration and enlightenment. *The Dhammapada* can bestow this gift: it has the power to bring to the heart and the mind of earnest readers "the right perception of existing things, the knowledge of the non-existent." . . . most of all, its sections awaken the mind and energize the heart and take them to a better way of living.

The Cunningham Press *Dhammapada* also contains a twenty-four-page discussion drawing upon various commentaries on Buddha and

Buddhism. By reading the publisher's Foreword and this concluding "Modern Perspectives on Buddha's Thought," the student benefits both by a succinct explanation of the present revival of Buddhism and also by the collected evidence that the revival is, indeed, widespread:

"THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENTS"

> There is a greater kinship felt for Buddha by Westerners than for any other figure in Eastern religion. Christians recognize the ethics of Jesus in Buddhist precepts. Western thinkers, to whom science has been the principal guide, sense that Buddha shared their own distrust of bigotry and uncritical belief. In H. G. Wells' *Outline of History,* for example, Buddha receives the unqualified admiration of the author as one of the world's greatest men, surely the greatest religious teacher. In recent years, various Western essayists have pointed out that in the teachings of Buddha is found an approach to the problems of life which in no way violates the scientific spirit. . . .
>
> Thus scholars and philosophers, and even Western religionists in whom an honest impartiality prevails, may be found deeply attracted to Buddhist thought. And today, there is a distinct revival of the vitality of Buddhism in the East. In Burma, in 1954, Prime Minister U Nu was instrumental in convoking a great council of Buddhists from many lands, an event which may be counted a fortunate accompaniment of the awakening of the nationalist spirit in the East. Western history would have been less bloody by far had there been a like influence at work at the time of the birth of the Western nations.

BUDDHISM IN INDIA

The essay continues, rounding out the picture of a cyclic decline and final rebirth:

> Buddhism obtained secure roots among the thousands of millions of Asians living in Ceylon, Burma, China, Tibet, and Japan. Eventually there was active persecution of the Buddhists by the Brahmans and some of the Indian princes, and dissensions and schisms among the Buddhists themselves were a weakening influence. First the Buddhists were driven from the large cities. Then, with the Mogul invasion, the decline of Indian Buddhism was accelerated until, during the sixteenth century, traces of Buddhism disappeared entirely from Kashmir, Bengal, and the Deccan.
>
> Even so, there are today probably more Buddhists in the world than followers of any other faith. Further, it is possible that a renewal of interest in Buddhism may take place in India, as a result of Gandhi's influence and from other causes. After Gandhi was released from one of his several prison terms by the British in 1924, he chose

for his first public appearance the Buddhist anniversary day. On this occasion he said:

"... I am more than most people endeavoring to popularize the truth for which Gotama Buddha lived and died.... I would like to tell the meeting what I believe about Buddhism. To me it is a part of Hinduism. Buddha did not give the world a new religion; he gave it a new interpretation. He taught Hinduism not to take but to give life. True sacrifice was not of others but of self."

A Philosopher Considers Psychical Research

The Journal of Philosophy for Dec. 9, 1954—only recently come to hand by courtesy of a subscriber—constitutes a unique issue of that publication. Never before, to our knowledge, has that august and conservative body known as the American Philosophical Association devoted a symposium to a subject such as "Psychical Research and Philosophy." But the surprises do not stop here. Dr. J. B. Rhine was invited to provide the introductory paper, and Brown University's Prof. C. J. Ducasse, defender of reincarnation theory, chosen to supplement Rhine's remarks.

Dr. Rhine made a strong effort to convince the academicians that ESP, even if not of tremendous immediate importance, raises vital questions in respect to the nature of man, the problem of free will, the possibility of immortality, etc.

Bringing the Issue to Focus

In some respects, this use of attested psychic happenings to influence reconsideration of basic questions is reminiscent of H. P. Blavatsky's employment of spiritualistic phenomena in the last century. Dr. Rhine jumps from the ESP laboratory to philosophical issues:

The key significance of the psi function lies, of course, in the fact that it can be measured and otherwise studied with respect to the criteria of physicality and demonstrated to depart from those criteria. Much of the rest of personality and the life functions of animals is, on this point, ambiguous and elusive and throughout the history of science has allowed completely opposite interpretations to prevail. Psi phenomena alone bring the issue into focus and allow a decision to be reached as to whether or not the organism possesses extraphysical powers. The investigation of psi has thus provided a scientific way of dealing with the question of the nature of man with respect to the physical world.

Without a reliable answer to this question of man's nature, it is not possible to solve intelligently the most important problems confront-

ing mankind. To appreciate the importance of this issue of the bearing of physicalism on human life, it is necessary only to consider the consequences of a strict application of a thoroughly mechanistic theory of man.

Rejection of Physicalism

The most far-reaching and revolting consequence lies in what would happen to volitional or mental freedom. Under a mechanistic determinism the cherished voluntarism of the individual would be nothing but idle fancy. Without the exercise of some freedom from physical law, the concepts of character, responsibility, moral judgment, and democracy would not survive critical analysis. The concept of a spiritual order, either in the individual or beyond him, would have no logical place whatever. In fact, little of the entire value system under which human society has developed would survive the establishment of a thoroughgoing philosophy of physicalism.

If Dr. Rhine presses these points a little too far, as Ducasse later suggests, his zeal must be regarded as commendable, and it is necessary to take into account the fact that he is addressing men who, though nominally philosophers, frequently refuse to consider any evidence not supplied by laboratory methods.

Inexcusable Ignorance

Dr. Ducasse is also outspoken in condemning the *a priori* rejection of paranormal happenings by scientists and philosophers. He writes:

The interest of the paper is made the greater by the fact that some evidence, both experimental and other, today exists that events—of which precognition is one—sometimes really occur that clash thus radically with one or another of the basic limiting principles of present scientific and common-sense thinking. Moreover, that evidence is both much stronger and more abundant than persons who have not looked it up commonly suspect. Hence the need is correspondingly acute either to explain away the evidence, or else to formulate some conception of Nature capable of including and of uniting both all the facts which the natural sciences have discovered, and the rarer paradoxical and seemingly anarchistic facts with which the parapsychology laboratories and societies for psychical research have concerned themselves, but which scientists and philosophers have so far largely been content either to ignore or to declare impossible on *a priori* grounds.

For these reasons, Dr. Ducasse affirms, "philosophers ought to take a hand in devising the needed new conceptual framework as they did

when, in the 17th century, a similar need resulted from the new facts which were then being discovered."

What is "Established"?

One comment by Dr. Ducasse should be of particular interest to Theosophists who, although appreciative of Dr. Rhine's promising work, have felt that the laboratory method is too slow and restrictive as a means of opening up realms beyond the senses. He points out that Rhine is not justified in assuming that laboratory means are the *only* "way of dealing with the question of the nature of man." He continues:

> For discovery of the conditions on which a given kind of phenomenon depends, experimentation under controlled conditions is highly desirable and often indispensable. But such control is not indispensable for the purpose of establishing that a given sort of phenomenon *has actually occurred.* Moreover, it is the *reality* of a paradoxical phenomenon—that is, *its having actually occurred*—which establishes the existence of otherwise unsuspected ranges of possibilities; and which, even before these are explored, condemns as provincial any conception of Nature which has no room for that phenomenon.

How much can Respectable Philosophers Stand?

Ducasse then discusses the remarkable testimony of reputable nineteenth-century investigators—men like Sir William Crookes, who interpreted the wave of phenomenalism in his time without bias or undue skepticism. Had the Brown University philosopher been living during the early days of the Theosophical Society, there is little doubt that he would have approved its purposes—probably joined its ranks. For his interest is in the *meaning* of strange phenomena—what they may reveal about the hidden aspects of man's nature. He is willing to read *all* sorts of testimony, even such as pertains to occult powers. He affirms that a vast collection of data on occult powers has for too long been summarily thrown out of scientific court; then continues his lecture before the Philosophical Association with a serious discussion of levitation data—perhaps to show that, for philosophers, nothing can be ruled out, *a priori,* as impossible:

> This leads me now to consider some reports of a spontaneous paranormal phenomenon [levitation] which illustrates the philosophically important point just made. Moreover, it manifests the greater richness of content which spontaneous phenomena usually have

> as compared with experimental ones. Another reason for considering [levitation phenomena] is that the nature and strength of the evidence on record for its occurrence is likely to be something of a surprise to philosophers who have not looked it up. And lastly, the difficulty of explaining away that evidence at all plausibly makes especially pointed the questions I mentioned at the outset concerning the psychology of credulity and incredulity, as contrasted with the logic of rational belief and disbelief.

Reincarnation Theory

Dr. Ducasse has had considerable experience in attempting to penetrate the wall of scepticism, and perhaps selected "levitation" for discussion to jolt his colleagues' minds a little; he once presented a number of carefully drawn arguments in favor of the soul's survival after death, but failed to get the due of attention his efforts deserved. The concluding section of his Paul Carus lectures, given before the American Philosophical Association in 1949, is devoted to the philosophy of rebirth—repeating, sometimes nearly item for item, arguments marshaled by H. P. Blavatsky and William Q. Judge in behalf of impartial consideration for the concept. "The hypothesis of survival through rebirth," Ducasse wrote, "because what it supposes is so like the life we know, can be imagined most clearly. Not only has it had wide popular acceptance, but it has also commended itself to some of the most eminent thinkers not only in the East but also in the West."

Equilibrium in Moral Education

While somewhat afield from psychical research, this seems a suitable occasion for introduction of some of Dr. Ducasse's most impressive passages in regard to reincarnation. In his chapter on "Survival After Death," Ducasse shows that rebirth is truly a *philosophical* idea, oversimplified and rather spoiled if presented only in the form of a religious belief. Regarded from a religious point of view, Ducasse contends, rebirth often means a sort of "eye for an eye" and "tooth for a tooth" method of retribution in future lives; this presentation of reincarnation, in turn, invites rejection on the ground that such punishment would not be just, since we have no memory of all supposed wrong-doings in previous lives.

Thus setting the problem, Dr. Ducasse examines the weakness of such reasoning:

When survival has been thought of as later lives on earth, the redress has been conceived to consist in this—that the good and evil deeds, the strivings, the experiences, and the merits and faults of one life, all would have their just fruits in subsequent lives; in short, that as a man soweth, so shall he also reap.

Now, however, it may be objected that, without memory of what one is being rewarded or punished for, one learns nothing from the retribution, which is then ethically useless.

As regards Dick, on the other hand, compensation for his unmerited injury at the hand of Tom need not consist in the immoral pleasure of retaliation upon Tom. The injury, which as such robs him of certain powers or opportunities, might lead him to develop other and more significant capacities latent in him, or might awaken him to other and better opportunities of which he would otherwise have remained unaware.

Philosophical Justice

Compensation for injury can be paid in various kinds of coin, and can truly compensate no matter at whose hands the payment comes; and, on the side of the doer of injury, the ends of justice are truly served if the wages of vice turn out to be eventual virtue.

It is further conceivable that Tom's eventual landing into a situation forcing him to practice patience should be a perfectly natural consequence of his vice of impatience. Each of us that is old and mature enough to view the course of his life in perspective can see that again and again his aptitudes, his habits, his tastes or interests, his virtues or his vices—in short, what he was at a given time—brought about, not by plan but automatically, changes in his material or social circumstances, in his associates, in his opportunities and so on; and that these changes in turn, quite as much as those due to purely external causes, contributed to shape for the better or the worse what he then became.

The Continuous Self

This, which is observable within one life, could occur equally naturally as between the present and the subsequent bodied lives of a continuous though gradually changing self.

These suppositions have been introduced here only to make clear that the *lex talionis* conception of the justice for which later lives would provide the opportunity is crude and limited, and is far from being the only imaginable form justice could take, or necessarily the most effective. Those suppositions have also made clear that, for the moral education and the compensation which are the ends of justice, memory of the injury done and knowledge that an eventual educative consequence or piece of good fortune is a consequence of the injury

done or sustained, is not in the least necessary, as on the contrary it is, where the *lex talionis* is the instrument of justice employed.

In consideration of the above we find it a matter of small wonder that Dr. Ducasse's contributions in *Philosophy* on the subject of psychical research are broad and penetrating.

DEATH BAN RECEIVES SUPPORT

Two Los Angeles newspapers (the *Times,* Jan. 28, and the *Mirror-News,* March 12) note that the Southern California-Arizona Methodist Conference and the Episcopal Diocese of Los Angeles have gone on record in favor of abolishing capital punishment. In addition, the *Mirror-News* cites the opinion of Dr. William F. Graves, member of the Friends Committee on Legislation, which sponsored the bills at Sacramento. Dr. Graves, as a physician at San Quentin penitentiary for two years, has had, the *Mirror* states, "an opportunity to observe the effect of the death penalty on prison personnel, relatives of the convicted and on society at large." Dr. Graves says he "opposes capital punishment on moral grounds," because "the extreme penalty tends to lower the moral tone of society, and therefore to increase crime rather than to deter it."

LEGISLATIVE ISSUES

Since such bills are on the agenda of many Legislature sessions, voters who write to proponents of such bills may hope that their letters will be cumulatively effective. One subscriber to THEOSOPHY, who evidently feels deeply on both the subject of capital punishment and the reading of the Bible in the public schools, wrote to representatives as follows:

Honorable Augustus F. Hawkins
Assemblyman 62nd District
House Building
Sacramento, California
Dear Sir:

I understand that considerations are now before the House on two issues about which I have deep convictions. The first is the move to abolish capital punishment in our state. Whenever this issue has come up I have always voted against capital punishment. No doubt you are familiar with the many valid arguments against this practice, so I won't take up your time enumerating them; but it is significant to note that *most* wardens of prisons who have had to engage in putting men to death are strenuously opposed to it.

I think that legalized killing is a crime against humanity. The effects of it on society as a whole are bad. It frustrates human purpose and does not right a wrong. We might ask ourselves—Just how are we benefited by snuffing out someone's life via the mechanism of the State? Even viewing the practice merely from a statistical basis shows that it has made no improvement in society. Our country has the highest incidence of murder in the world. Furthermore, the anguish of the men in death row must hang as a heavy pall over us all.

The second issue is that of the attempt to subvert our traditional practice of separation of Church and State—*i.e.,* reading the Bible in the public schools, hoping to encourage moral and ethical education. I am surely not against moral and ethical education, but I do not think it will be accomplished in this way. History shows us that any union of Church and State has been disastrous to the spirit of free inquiry. We need to help our youngsters to acquire an enduring faith in the dignity and nobility of man, by ourselves living the kind of lives which exemplify the highest morals and ethics. Reading verses from a book is an empty approach, no matter how wonderful the book.

I would greatly appreciate your casting a negative vote on this issue, and to help abolish capital punishment. I sympathize with the legislators in having to try and make wise decisions on these issues, and hope my views will be of some help.

An Encouraging Response

Mr. Hawkins replied:

This will acknowledge your letter . . . regarding the abolishment of capital punishment and the so-called Bible reading bill. I have read with considerable interest your statements on these two matters, and agree with the position taken by you. I have opposed the so-called Bible reading bill in the past Sessions and will continue in my opposition.

As to capital punishment, I am a co-author of the bills to abolish this practice and while I expect this is going to be difficult legislation to pass at this Session, I believe that such letters as yours will help to overcome the resistance, and that we may be able to make some gains.

Many thanks for your communication, and please be assured that any further communications from you on these subjects will be appreciated.

Further Communications

Our subscriber wrote another letter to Mr. Hawkins, enclosing the lead article in Manas, Sept. 1, "The Worth of Human Life," eliciting this further response:

> This will acknowledge receipt of your letter and the publication containing the article on Capital Punishment. It is by far the best material on this subject that I have seen, and I have had photostatic copies made of it and given them to Mr. McMillan, the main author of the bill to abolish capital punishment, and other members of the Committee which will consider this subject.

Such a reception should, we think, inspire others who may wish similarly to go on record as supporting these bills. Good precedent is offered, certainly, by H. P. Blavatsky in her *Key to Theosophy,* where she said:

THE T.S. AND POLITICAL REFORM

> The very principles of the T.S. are proof that it does not—or, rather, that most of its members do not—stand aloof. . . . Let me briefly remind you that these principles are—universal Unity and Causation; Human Solidarity; the Law of Karma; Re-incarnation. These are the four links of the golden chain which should bind humanity into one family, one universal Brotherhood. . . .
>
> Every Theosophist, therefore, is bound to do his utmost to help on, by all the means in his power, every wise and well-considered social effort. . . . One general test may be given. Will the proposed action tend to promote that true brotherhood which it is the aim of Theosophy to bring about? (*Key to Theosophy,* pp. 232, 233, 235-6.)

MR. JUDGE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

"My view," William Q. Judge wrote, "is that capital punishment is both useless and injurious. It is as great an injustice to the world of beings left unexecuted as to the one so violently sent out of life. . . . It seems hardly possible that anyone could believe in theosophical and occult doctrines and at the same time commend capital punishment. . . .

"The killing of a human being by the authority of the state is morally wrong and also an injury to all the people; no criminal should be executed no matter what the offense. . . .

"The Theosophist who believes in the multiple nature of man and in the complexity of his inner nature, and knows that that is governed by law and not by mere chance or by the fancy of those who prate of the need for protecting society when they do not know the right way to do it . . . will oppose capital punishment. He sees it is unjust to the living, a danger to the state, and that it allows no chance whatever for any reformation of the criminal."